ECCLESIA LAW

Private Ecclesiastical Counsel
United States & International

Ecclesia Law – Independent Research Division

Subject: *Mikey P Interview – The "Watson Case" in Light of the Law of Agency Between Natural and Artificial Persons*

---

1 Context and Purpose

This report situates the claims made by "Mikey P." about the *Watson* case and the supposed "jurisdictional gap" within orthodox English law governing **agency between natural and artificial persons**

It compares his assertions to the established doctrines of *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd* and *Freeman & Lockyer v Buckhurst Park Properties* to demonstrate why the claimed split between the "living man" and the "corporate fiction" cannot create legal immunity.

---

2 The Alleged Jurisdiction Gap

Mikey P. argues that the *Watson* matter proved courts accept a separation between "the living woman" and "the all-caps corporate name." In agency terms, he treats the human being as an unwilling agent who can rescind the relationship by declaration.
However, English law holds that **agency arises only through consent and authority**, and that artificial persons act *through* authorised natural persons, never in opposition to them

There is no reported decision creating a *Watson* precedent. Even if a local judge recognised a litigant's sincerity, that expression has no binding effect. The supposed "jurisdictional gap" confuses **dual capacity** (a person acting personally and representatively) with **dual personality**, which English law rejects since *Salomon*.

ECCLESIA LAW

3 Why the Gap Theory Collapses

1. **Statutory Definition of "Person."** The Interpretation Act 1978 provides that *"'Person' includes a body of persons corporate or unincorporate."* Both human and corporation fall under the same legislative term; one cannot opt out by style or declaration.
2. **Separate Legal Personality.** *Salomon* confirmed that once a company or estate exists, it is "a different person altogether from the subscribers." The law already accounts for that separation; it does not allow an individual to erase liability by disowning agency.
3. **Agency Requires Evidence.** Under *Freeman & Lockyer*, authority must be proved by representation and reliance. Mere refusal of agency has no effect unless third parties were on notice.
4. **Executor Analogy.** As shown in *Pett v Pett*, acting without authority makes one an *executor de son tort*—personally liable

   Similarly, a citizen who "disclaims" the corporate name still manages its affairs and remains liable.

---

4 Categorising Mikey P.'s Arguments

Claim	Pseudo-Law Category	Doctrinal Response
The "ALL-CAPS" name is a corporation	Pseudo-law typography theory	Typographical form has no legal significance; companies are created by incorporation, not orthography.
"Living man under God" is beyond statute	Man-Under-God theory	Religious belief does not alter forum jurisdiction; courts apply *lex fori*.
Birth certificate creates a trust	Common pseudo-trust theory	No statutory basis; registration merely records identity.
Court papers monetised as bonds	Redemptionism / hybrid	No evidence; bills of exchange doctrine limited to commercial instruments under the 1882 Act

---

ECCLESIA LAW

5 Agency as the True Bridge

Ecclesia Law's doctrinal paper clarifies that **agency** is the legitimate bridge between human and legal person.
Artificial persons can only act through authorised human agents; likewise, humans can act for artificial estates only with appointment and consent

Where Mikey P. posits involuntary servitude to a "corporate persona," the law sees a routine administrative relationship—one that can be changed only through formal legal mechanisms (resignation, dissolution, or delegation), not unilateral proclamation.

---

6 Jurisdiction and the Myth of Escape

Jurisdiction in England depends on:

- **Subject matter** – e.g., civil or criminal competence.
- **Territory** – England & Wales.
- **Capacity** – whether a party sues personally or representatively

There is no fourth dimension for "living souls." The *Watson* narrative misreads these ordinary categories. Courts simply proceed against whichever legal capacity is named in pleadings; if a person files as "John Smith," the court treats that as the human defendant. No metaphysical distinction arises.

---

7 Why Such Theories Persist

They persist because they re-frame structural powerlessness as mis-registration. The story "you are not the name" feels empowering, but legally it converts moral frustration into procedural self-sabotage: pleadings are struck out, default judgments entered, and debtors incur costs.

ECCLESIA LAW

8 Conclusion

The *Mikey P.* presentation represents a hybrid of pseudo-law and man-under-God thought. Its reliance on an imagined *Watson* precedent, typographic personhood, and unilateral agency revocation has **no foundation in English doctrine**.

English law already recognises the dual existence of natural and artificial persons but regulates it through **agency, capacity, and authority**, not through faith or declaration. Understanding that orthodoxy—summarised in *Agency Between Natural and Artificial Persons in English Law*—explains precisely why pseudo-law "jurisdictional gaps" fail in every courtroom: they confuse theological or moral identity with the legal mechanisms that actually allocate responsibility.

Prepared by Ecclesia Law – Independent Research Division
Comparative Legal Studies Section | December 2025

Ecclesia Law and Lucius Benedict are trading styles of MLITR Research LLC, Wyoming, USA Forensic, Fiduciary, and Compliance Solutions for the Ecclesiastical and Private Trust Community operating under Attorney in Fact Mandates.